

Application No. 09/845,104

Remarks

Applicants thank the Examiner for his careful consideration of the application.

Claims 1 – 16 and 18 - 23 stand rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3 – 6, and 8 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Spicer et al. (US Patent No. 7,007,093) ("Spicer"). These rejections are moot as these claims have been canceled.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spicer in view of Barnard et al. (US Patent No. 6,854,121) ("Barnard"). This rejection is moot as this claim has been canceled.

The Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spicer in view of Barnard, in further view of Grantges et al. (US Patent No. 6,510,464) ("Grantges"). This rejection is moot as this claim has been canceled.

The Examiner rejected claims 9, 10, 13 – 15, and 20 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spicer in view of Bakshi et al. (US Patent No. 6,457,054) ("Bakshi"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In claim 9, Applicants recite a method of accessing an internal network device on a protected network that includes a security device. The method includes storing data addressed to the internal network device in an external proxy server and maintaining a proxy agent on the protected network. The proxy agent polls the external proxy server for data addressed to the internal network device, forwards to the internal network device any data on the external proxy server and addressed to the internal network device, and forwards to the external proxy server any data addressed to an external device in communication with the external proxy server. Polling the external proxy server includes connecting to the external

Application No. 09/845,104

proxy server to check for pending traffic, receiving a stream of spurious bytes from the external proxy server if there is nothing pending for the internal network device, and receiving data from the external proxy server when the external proxy server has received data from a client.

The Examiner should allow claim 9, as the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness over Bakshi in view of Spicer. Specifically, the Examiner has not shown, for example, that either reference teaches or suggests forwarding to the external proxy server any data addressed to an external device in communication with the external proxy server. The Examiner asserts that column 4, lines 4 - 24 show this feature. In the section identified by the Examiner, Applicants see no mention of the proxy agent forwarding information that is addressed to an external device to the proxy server. The polling server of Spicer does not appear to perform all the functions of Applicants proxy server. The passage cited by the Examiner appears to disclose a polling server polling an external proxy server for information, the external proxy server sending information it has queued to the internal polling server in response to being polled, and the polling server forwarding that information to the enterprise server, which passes it along to the appropriate network resource. Applicants see no mention of the polling server then forwarding data addressed to an external device to the proxy server. In order to sustain a rejection based upon a combination of references under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the references or the prior art generally must teach or suggest each and every limitation. As the Examiner has pointed to no portion of either Spicer or Bakshi that discloses forwarding to the external proxy server any data addressed to an external device in communication with the external proxy server, the rejection should be withdrawn and claim 9 allowed.

The Examiner should allow claims 10, 13 – 15, and 20 if claim 9 is allowed as claims 10, 13 – 15, and 20 depend from claim 9.

The Examiner rejected claims 11, 12, 16, 20, 21, and 23 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spicer in view of Bakshi, and further in view of Grantges. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. For the reasons given with respect to claim

Application No. 09/845,104

9, the Examiner should allow claims 11, 12, 16, 20, 21, and 23 if claim 9 is allowed as claims 11, 12, 16, 20, 21, and 23 depend from claim 9.


Applicants note that claim 22 was not addressed by the Examiner, but would still argue that claim 22 should be allowed if claim 9 is allowed.

Conclusion

No additional fee is believed to be required for this amendment. However, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025. This also constitutes a request for any needed extension of time and authorization to charge all fees therefor to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

A telephone interview is respectfully requested at the number listed below prior to any further Office Action, i.e., if the Examiner has any remaining questions or issues to address after this paper. The undersigned will be happy to discuss any further Examiner-proposed amendments as may be appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,


Joseph M. Young
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 45,248
Telephone (503) 685-4229

JMY/rjc